<center>**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**</center>

Claims 1-10, 15 and 16 are pending in this application. Claims 1-10, 15 and 16 have been finally rejected.

The Examiner rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. By this Amendment, claim 10 has been canceled. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112 should now be withdrawn.

The Examiner objects to claims 1-10, 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Donoho in view of Schoenberg.

The Examiner cites Donoho as teaching a method for storing and reporting pharmacy data. The Examiner concedes, however, that Donoho does not teach providing first access security, second access security, checking whether the respective electronic pharmacy data meet at least one predefined validity requirement defined by the processing center, receiving by the processing center a transfer of the respective electronic pharmacy data, processing, organizing and structuring the electronic pharmacy data, storing the processed electronic pharmacy data in a data warehouse, storing subsets of the data in a datamart and receiving by the processing center a data request from a data requestor to obtain at least a portion of the electronic pharmacy data, the data requestor having a privilege level identifying the type of data available to the requestor and providing third access security and fourth access security in order to release the data and formatting the portion of the electronic pharmacy requested by the data requestor into a report.

The Examiner cites Schoenberg for the missing teachings. In particular, the Examiner cites Schoenberg for the teaching of providing first access security by the processing center in response to the data transfer request wherein the first access security includes checking credentials defined by the processing center and submitted for authorization and providing second access security by the processing center in case it passes the first access security wherein the second access security includes, prior to accepting the respective data by the processing center, checking whether the respective electronic pharmacy data meet at least one predefined validity requirement defined by the processing center. The Examiner cites Schoenberg column 6, lines 26-50 and Fig. 3.

The Examiner is mistaken. Schoenberg discloses a system for distributing health information. The Examiner is incorrect that Schoenberg teaches first and second access security

as claimed. At column 6, lines 26-50, with reference to Figs. 2 and 3, Schoenberg receives health information and generates security access codes 202 (see Fig. 2) and assigns one or more security access codes to each of the categories of the health information. However, Schoenberg does not teach or suggest what Applicant's invention does. Applicant's invention only will receive and process the information from the pharmacies if it passes the first and second access security. In contrast, in the Schoenberg reference, there is no provision for determining whether the information that is received is reliable and whether it should be received and processed in the first place, i.e., there is nothing in Schoenberg which teaches or suggests passing first and second access securities before the information is received and processed. Schoenberg merely receives the information and then categorizes it and assigns access codes to it so that if a request is later made for that information, the request will only be granted if the access codes are met.

Thus, Schoenberg's system requires access codes to retrieve the information from his system as requested by a data requestor. However, Schoenberg does not teach or suggest verifying the information in the first place before it is stored in the system for later retrieval. Thus, Schoenberg utterly fails to teach or suggest providing the first and second access security as recited in the claims. Schoenberg's system merely sets up the access securities for later data retrieval as described at column 6, lines 26-50. In particular, if the Examiner will review the cited portions of the reference, the security access codes at 302 are generated by the data transferor in step 202 of Fig. 2. That is, when the information is received, access codes are generated to be associated with the information so that the information can be retrieved later on only if the access codes are provided. There is nothing in Schoenberg which teaches or suggests that the information is checked against first and second access security when it is being received in order to ascertain that the information should be received and stored in the first place.

In particular, claim 1 of the present invention recites, in pertinent part:

"receiving over a network, by a processing center of the managed care organization, a data transfer request to transfer respective electronic pharmacy data from at least one of the plurality of pharmacies;

providing first access security by the processing center in response to the data transfer request (of data from the pharmacy), wherein the first access security includes checking

credentials defined by the processing center and submitted <u>for authorization</u> by the at least one pharmacy;

     providing second access security by the processing center in case the at least one pharmacy passes the first access security, wherein the second access security includes, <u>prior to accepting the respective electronic pharmacy data</u> by the processing center, <u>checking whether</u> the respective electronic pharmacy data <u>meet at least one predefined validity requirement</u> defined by the processing center."

     Schoenberg does none of this. Schoenberg merely receives patient data and generates security access codes for later retrieval. Schoenberg fails to teach or suggest "checking credentials...for authorization," as claimed, and "<u>prior to accepting</u> the respective electronic pharmacy data by the processing center, <u>checking whether</u> the respective electronic pharmacy data meet <u>at least one predefined validity requirement</u> defined by the processing center." Schoenberg receives the data, allows the transferor of the data to set up access codes, but teaches or suggests nothing about verifying if the data should be received in the first place. In contrast, the present invention is directed, at least in part, to verifying whether the data should be received, processed and stored into the system in the first place. Schoenberg is completely silent regarding this and therefore, taken alone or in combination with Donoho, fails to teach or suggest the invention.

     Accordingly, it is submitted that all claims in this application are in condition for allowance, prompt notification of which is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS FILING
SYSTEM ON August 24, 2009

James A. Finder
Registration No.: 30,173
OSTROLENK FABER LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700

LCD/jh

01061483.1